REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1 – 24. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above captioned patent application in light of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Multer et al. (US# 6,757,696 B2, "Multer"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent Claim 1 recites a limitation where a first device accesses account information of a second handheld device on a remote server. Moreover independent Claim 1 recites a limitation where the first handheld device causes the account information of the second handheld device to be modified on the server as claimed. Furthermore, independent Claim 1 recites a limitation where the second handheld device accesses the remote server which automatically downloads the information while providing access to other handheld devices for said information. In fact, access of more than one handheld device to the same information is supported by defining a working group.

Multer discloses that a connection is established by authenticating the user identification via the server (see Multer, col. 34, lines 16-19) wherein the server supports the accounting, sign-up registration, device edition, storage server selection, and similar functions for each user in the system (see Multer, col. 31, lines 58-60). According to Multer, each user accesses the server after

authentication, wherein the server supports device edition and similar functions for each user. Therefore, Multer is directed to a system where the server supports accounting, sign-up registration, device edition, storage server selection and similar functions for that particular user that has been authenticated. Therefore, independent Claim 1 distinguishes over Multer by reciting a limitation where a first handheld device accesses the account for a second handheld device stored on the server, as claimed.

Furthermore, Multer discloses that each Application Object (AO) is a software component that interfaces with the third party application (see Multer, col. 16, lines 21-22) where the AO digests the third party application causing the resulting difference (add, delete, modify) to be logged, hence the user's personal information store is maintained on a user by user basis (see Multer, col. 17, lines 9-20). Therefore, Multer discloses a system where the AO digests the third party application and logs the difference, hence modifying it based on the difference logged. Accordingly, Multer is directed to a system where the AO is invoked by the user directly in order to modify. Therefore, independent Claim 1 distinguishes over Multer by reciting a limitation where the first handheld device causes the account information of the second handheld device to be modified on the server as claimed.

Moreover, independent Claim 1 distinguishes over Multer by reciting a limitation where the remote server automatically downloads the information to the second handheld device "while providing access to other handheld devices for said information", as claimed. In contrast Multer not only does not disclose the recited limitation of independent Claim 1, but teaches away from the claimed invention by disclosing that once authentication is successful the server locks the storage server

so that no conflicting device engines may couple to the same data at the same time (see Multer, col. 34, lines 19-22).

Accordingly, Multer neither teaches nor suggests the limitations of independent Claim 1, and in fact teaches away from the recited limitations. Independent claims 12 and 21 have similar limitations. Therefore, independent Claims 1, 12 and 21 are patentable over Multer under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Dependent claims are patentable over Multer, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by virtue of their dependency. As such, allowance of Claims 1-24 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, the Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims 1-24 is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-24 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-24 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Dated: *Feb 21*   , 2006

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile